

Serial No. 09/542,243

REMARKS

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for considering the present application. In the Final Office Action mailed August 29, 2002, claims 18-28 are pending in the application. The Examiner should note that claim 17 was canceled in the previous response. Claims 1-16 which were withdrawn previously pursuant to a restriction requirement are herein canceled without prejudice to applicant's right to file a divisional application to have Claims 1-16 examined. Claims 29-66 have been herein added. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner for reconsideration of the remaining claims.

Claims 17 and 18-20 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Oliver* (6,166,329) in view of *McDonald* (6,335,753). Applicant canceled claim 17 and amended claim 18 to be dependent from claim 21 in the previous response. Claims 19 and 20 depend from claims 18 and 19, respectively.

Claims 21-25 and 27 stand rejected as being unpatentable over *Oliver* in view of *McDonald* and *Mast* (6,166,705). Applicant respectfully traverses.

Applicant previously rewrote claim 21 in independent form. This fact does not seem to have been acknowledged by the Examiner. The recitation of Claim 21 includes a plurality of studs, satellite wires positioned adjacent to the studs having a first termination outside the building, a connector coupled to the second termination, a drywall layer, and a radome that encloses the first termination. *Oliver* merely teaches electrical wires positioned within a wall. *Oliver* does not teach or suggest anything related to satellites. The *McDonald*

Serial No. 09/542,243

reference illustrates phone wires positioned within a wall that carry reception from a satellite. The *Mast* reference illustrates a two-dimensional phased array antenna architecture. Applicant respectfully submits that no radome is provided in the *Mast* reference. In the Examiner's response to the Applicant's arguments, the description in Col. 3, lines 10-17, is cited as being the radome. Applicant admits that an antenna assembly is formed but the radiating elements 30 are positioned outside the sealed housing as shown in Figures 1-4. Therefore this element is not a radome in which an antenna is enclosed as recited in the present invention. *Mast* is merely the antenna itself. Furthermore, no termination of a satellite wire is taught in *Mast*.

Both the *Oliver* reference and the *McDonald* reference fail to teach or suggest a radome. As mentioned above, the *Mast* reference also fails to teach or suggest a radome. Therefore, applicant respectfully requests the Examiner for reconsideration of claim 21.

Claims 18, 19 and 20 ultimately depend on amended claim 21. Claims 18, 19 and 20 contain further limitations of claim 21 and are allowable for the same reasons set forth above. Namely, the *Oliver* reference does not teach or suggest a radome.

Claims 26 and 28 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Oliver* in view of *Mast* and *Spano* (6,204,823) and *Iwamura* (5,940,028). The *Spano* reference teaches a low profile antennas positioner for adjusting elevation and azimuth. No teaching or suggestion is found in this reference for providing a termination within a radome. *Iwamura* provides a

Serial No. 09/542,243

system and method for aligning an antenna. Neither of these two references provides a teaching or suggestion for a termination of a satellite wire within a radome. Therefore, applicant respectfully requests the Examiner for reconsideration of this rejection as well.


New claims 29-66 are directed to a multiple unit building, a multiple unit satellite ready building and a method of forming the same. As discussed on page 2 lines 1-9 of the specification, many multi-unit condominiums as an example are subject to strict condominium association regulations governing use of conventional satellite antennas for reception of satellite based services. Apartment building owners have also been known to impose restrictions that prevent tenants from mounting satellite dishes on the roof or the balcony of their respective units. The present invention as claimed in the new claims will address this problem by providing a mechanism for reception of satellite services that will not be visually intrusive or structurally protruding as discussed for example on page 2, lines 10-22 and page 3 of the specification and, therefore may be acceptable under these association regulations. In the present application the phrase "multiple unit buildings" or similar terms are intended to cover various types of buildings including commercial buildings and multiple-unit family dwellings and buildings with multiple rooms. It is respectfully submitted that none of the cited references teach or suggest the present invention as claimed in the newly presented claims.

In light of the above amendments and remarks, applicant submits that the rejections are now overcome. Applicant has added no new material to the

Serial No. 09/542,243

application by these amendments. The application is now in condition for allowance and expeditious notice thereof is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments that would place the application in better condition for allowance, he is respectfully requested to call the undersigned attorney at the below-listed number.

Respectfully submitted,


Vijayalakshmi D. Duraiswamy
Registration No. 31,505
Attorney for Applicant

Date: November 22, 2002
Hughes Electronics Corporation
ES/001/A109
P.O. Box 956
El Segundo, CA 90245-0956
(310) 662-9919

Serial No. 09/542,243

VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE

IN THE CLAIMS:

Claims 1-16 are being canceled without prejudice.

New claims 29-66 have been presented in this amendment.